DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 031 248 JC 690 289

By-Hammond, Edward H.
Personnel Services in Missouri Public Junior Colleges.
Pub Date [69]
Note-16p.; NDEA Institute paper
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.90
Descriptors-*Evaluation, *Junior Colleges, Questionnaires, *Student Personnel Services
Identifiers-Missouri

The junior college, to apply its understanding of society as it relates to education, must have a sound student personnel program. This study of programs at Missouri's 11 junior colleges examined their functions and financing to see what improvements might be made. A questionnaire was developed as a checklist of functions necessary to develop an effective program. In Part I, 59 functions were condensed into 19 scales for negative response ranking for each college; Part II collected data on budget and enrollment. The replies showed almost no extended programs, no orientation courses for credit, and few for study skills. Most provided career advisement, but not enough follow-up or manpower studies on which to base it. Most educational testing programs were for academic rather than personality or interest measurement. All provided consultation for the students on their plans and problems. Ten colleges analyzed co-curricular activities programs; all had a form of student government; only half had a leadership development program. All maintained a program to control the social climate and academic development. All provided precollege information on admissions and financial aid, and maintained student records--though few made much use of the latter. As for health services, only half had part- or full-time nurses. The colleges varied widely in enrollment and available funds. The failings implicit in these findings and suggestions for their correction are discussed. (HH)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED021240

PERSONNEL SERVICES IN MISSOURI PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES

Edward H. Hammond

University of Missouri

Today, more than ever before, the junior college student personnel services must be in a position to understand and react to the social structure and its integral relationship to education. The time has come when it is paramount that all the junior colleges have the basic student personnel program necessary to obtain this important position. The public junior colleges in Missouri have a stated responsibility to provide a student personnel program for their students. But this responsibility goes beyond the services and into the area of total effect because the public junior colleges in Missouri are committed to educate the whole individual (Smith, 1968).

The purpose of this study was to determine if the public junior colleges in Missouri have the basic student personnel program to meet their important commitment. In a report by the National Committee for the Appraisal and Development of Junior College Student Personnel Programs (1966), Raines stated that three-fourths of the junior colleges in the country have not developed adequate student personnel programs. It was because of the question raised by this statement and other similar statements that were made by Collins (1964), Johnson (1966), and Matson (1967) that the researcher decided to take a mansuetude look at the student personnel programs of

Los Angeles JC

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JUL 23 1969

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

the public junior colleges of Missouri. This analysis was focused on the two essential elements of any student personnel program: function and financing.

It is very easy to criticize the shortcomings of any educational effort of man in these irascible times. Indeed, any individual who would give more than ten minutes of serious thought to the problem could find much to criticize. But the researcher has a deep respect for the many accomplishments of the public junior college student personnel programs in Missouri and only wishes to supply them and other synonymous institutions with some relevant information about their programs which might help them in their constant development.

Method

A questionnaire was developed which was intended to investigate the major personnel services at the junior college level. The instrument was based on the results of the study by the National Committee for the Appraisal and Development of Junior College Student Personnel Programs (Raines, 1964). In building the questionnaire suggestions were also drawn from Arbuckle (1953), Collins (1967), McDaniel (1962), Mueller (1961), Williamson (1961) and Wrenn (1951).

The first part of the instrument served as a checklist of related functions designed to support the instructional needs, respond to the student needs, and foster institutional wide cooperation and development as a junior college student personnel program. The respondents were asked to read the list

of fifty-nine functions and indicate which are performed at their institutions. The fifty-nine functions were then condensed into nineteen scales and ranked according to the number of negative responses for each institution forming a "program rank". In the second part of the instrument the respondents supplied statistical information about their institutions' 1968-1969 student personnel operating budget and student population. A "budget rank" and a "full time equivalent (FTE) student rank" were then developed and correlated with the "program rank" at the .01 level of significance.

Sample

The questionnaire was sent to all the Missouri public junior colleges. All of the eleven institutions responded to the questionnaire without any follow-up.

Findings

In order to maximize the analysis of the data, some of the results were summarized within the basic functional design used by Raines (1966) in reporting the conclusions of the National Committee for the Appraisal and Development of Junior College Student Personnel Programs. The tabulated results are presented in Table 1.

Orientation to College and Career Opportunities (Composite of Scales 7-9-16-18). The replies to the questions regarding the orientation function indicated the almost total neglect of extended programs in this very important area. The public junior colleges within the state of Missouri offer no orientation course for credit of any length. Only 36% of the

institutions offer courses, for credit or non-credit, to develop the study skills of their incoming students.

The placement or career information function is being maintained in one form or another by almost all of the state junior colleges, but 27% of these institutions fail to conduct any follow-up studies on the students they have placed. Of a more important nature is the fact that 36% of the Missouri public junior colleges do not participate in studies of manpower needs within their community to develop the foundation for the placement function.

Appraisal of Individual Potentialities and Limitations (Composite of Scales 3 & 15). All the Missouri public junior colleges are involved in educational testing programs. Only two of the institutions have not developed normative and predictive data for their own student population. The emphasis in this functional area falls more on the evaluation of the past record, in order to assure proper placement of students in various courses, instead of measuring the interest, values, and personality factors of their students.

Every junior college studied indicated that they were involved in individual interpretation of senior college requirements. All but one institution had programs for individual interpretation of student study skills. Even though the junior colleges have programs to interpret study skills, less than two-thirds of the junior colleges in Missouri have programs to further develop these skills.

Consultation with Students about Their Plans, Programs, and Problems (Composite of Scales 14 & 17). All the Missouri public junior colleges have programs to consult with students about the interpretation of test scores, the interpretation of curricular requirements, and the interpretation of occupational information. Also, every institution studied had counseling services available to their students for whatever purpose the students wished.

Participation of Students in Activities that Supplement Classroom Experiences (Composite of Scales 10 & 11). Ten of the eleven public junior colleges in Missouri have ongoing programs to analyze the needs of co-curricular activities and facilities, with 82% of the institutions having developed informal educational programs outside their regular curriculum. Every institution studied has a form of student government with a wide range of controls. But only 54% of the state public junior colleges have any kind of leadership development program for their students.

Regulation to Provide an Optimal Climate for Social and Academic Development (Composite of Scales 6-12-13). All of the student personnel programs studied controlled the social climate by implementing various social policies which maintained the structure of a social calendar. Cases of social misconduct were handled by 81% of the student personnel programs. Only 45% of the programs supervised or worked with academic-oriented co-curricular activities.

Services that Facilitate College Attendance (Composite of Scales 1-2-4-5-8). Every Missouri public junior college has a precollege information program which confers with area high schools about admissions, prepares and distributes descriptive material about the institution, and handles inquiries about admission. All the student personnel programs studied had representation on an admissions committee which was responsible for admission policy.

Without exception every institution reviewed maintained a program to administer student financial aids. Programs to seek funds for loans and scholarships from within the community were found in 91% of the institutions.

All the student personnel programs reviewed had developed and were maintaining a student records system. But 19% of the institutions did not maintain any written policies regarding record accessibility nor did they use these records to conduct any kind of research on student characteristics.

Student Health Services (Scale 19). Part-time or full-time nurses were found to be available at only 45% of the Missouri public junior colleges and consulting physicians could only be found at 27% of the institutions studied. But 91% of the junior colleges provided their students with the opportunity to partake in some form of student health insurance.

The replies to the second part of the questionnaire indicated that the Missouri public junior colleges are a very heterogeneous group when such factors as full-time equivalent student population and the size of the 1968-1969

student personnel operating budget were considered. As shown in Table 2 a difference of 3,855 students was found between the largest and smallest institution and a difference of $451,800 was found between the largest and smallest student personnel operating budget.

The importance of financing to a junior college student personnel program was proven by a rank correlation test (Table 3). The "program rank", the ranking of the Missouri public junior colleges' student personnel programs by the instrument, and the "budget rank", the ranking of the student personnel operating budgets according to size, had a correlation of .7455 which is significant at the .01 level. The significant (.01) positive correlation of .7864 was also found between the "program rank" and the "FTE student rank", the ranking of the full-time equivalent student population of the Missouri public junior colleges according to size.

Implications

As the findings indicated the Missouri public junior colleges' student personnel programs are counselor oriented and seem to be organized in a traditional manner. Examination of the responses to the questionnaire and the ratings of the nineteen scales suggested four dangerous trends.

First, the Missouri public junior colleges' responses to the Precollege Information Scale (1), Applicant Appraisal Scale (2), Application Consulting Scale (14), Student Advisement Scale (15), Financial Aids (8), and the Student Registration Scale (5) indicated an extraordinary commitment to

"maintenir" functions of the student personnel area. When comparing the Orientation Scale (7) rating and the Group Orienting Scale (16) rating with the ratings of the scales mentioned above, it appeared that the processes of recruitment, admission, and registration outweighed the orientation of the student to his new environment. These inferences suggested that the student personnel programs of the Missouri public junior colleges are becoming placated domiciles of misplaced emphasis; "to get" rather than "to prepare".

The second trend was predominantly a result of a push to provide the complete range of student personnel services at all the Missouri public junior colleges regardless of their degree of development. This trend could best be labeled as "a failure to follow-up". In the study skills area 36% of the junior colleges evaluated their students but did not provide a development program of any kind. All the Missouri public junior colleges have programs to provide their students a vehicle for using their leadership ability but 46% of the institutions have not developed any kind of leadership training program. In the placement function over one-fourth of the colleges did not attempt any follow-up of their students. And in some cases the Missouri public junior colleges established a policy but then failed to put it into writing. The importance of follow-up can not be overlooked for long without the total program suffering from lack of direction.

The third trend was the lackadaisical manner in which the student health service needs were being met. In only 45% of

the Missouri public junior colleges can a nurse be found on a part-time or full-time basis and 73% of the institutions have not arranged for a consulting physician to advise the program. Student insurance of some type was offered in 91% of the junior colleges, but the replies suggested that this is provided out of a primary concern for protection of the institution. The reason for the lack of a comprehensive health service may be in part financial, but most communities have one physician who is willing to serve as a consulting physician to a student health program without a great deal of financial remuneration.

The fourth trend was the high positive correlation between the size of the student personnel operating budget and the extent to which the Missouri public junior colleges' student personnel programs are functioning actively in the surveyed areas. It might be unrealistic to believe that the Missouri public junior colleges can provide student personnel services on a limited budget. But investigation into the financial base of some select public junior colleges in California by Scheidt (1966) revealed that an institution could provide a good student personnel program if the program was receiving between 55 and 65 dollars per full-time equivalent student. If the program included some special projects, as a number of Missouri public junior colleges' student personnel programs did, this amount would be greater.

Summary

The Missouri public junior colleges are making a determined effort to provide student personnel programs that meet the needs of their institutions. But because of an overcommitment to the "maintenir" functions, the failure to follow-up, and the need for more comprehensive student health programs, the junior colleges in Missouri have not met their commitment to develop the whole individual. It is important to note that some individual institutions are meeting the commitment and very well, but many institutions are not.

The research results that have been described are not conclusive but they do suggest some serious questions. The most important question may be, "How is a student personnel program in a junior college provided on a limited budget?" The answer is not conclusive either. But student personnel programs could transfer their staff commitment for the "maintenir" functions over to clerical and paraprofessional staff members. The utilization of staff in this manner would permit the professional staff more time for guidance, follow-up and directional duties while fostering institutional wide cooperation and development.

REFERENCES

Arbuckle, D. Student personnel services in higher education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1953.

Collins, C. Critical needs and problems of the junior college clientele. Report on the Conference to Plan Research on Junior College Student Personnel Programs. Chicago (April 12, 1964), p.192.

Johnson, J. Personnel services in Illinois junior colleges. Journal of College Student Personnel, VII (July, 1966), p. 236.

Matson, J. The future of the junior college. National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Journal, IV (April, 1967), pp. 161-164.

Matson, J. Premises: Planning student personnel facilities. American Association of Junior Colleges. Washington, D. C. (April, 1967), p. 1.

McDaniel, J. Essential student personnel practices for junior colleges. American Association of Junior Colleges. Washington, D. C., 1962.

Mueller, K. Student personnel work in higher education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1961.

Raines, M. The purposes, preparation and nature of the research development conference. Report on the Conference to Plan Research on Junior College Student Personnel Programs. Chicago (April 12, 1964).

Raines, M. Student personnel situation. Junior College Journal, February, 1966.

Raines, M. Junior college student personnel programs: What they are and what they should be. American Association of Junior Colleges. Washington, D. C., 1967.

Scheidt, O. A study of the expense of student personnel services in selected California public junior colleges. University of California, 1966.

Smith, M. Final report - Missouri public junior college study. Missouri Commission on Higher Education, July, 1968.

Williamson, E. Student personnel services in colleges and universities. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.

Wrenn, C. Student personnel work in colleges. New York: Ronald Press, 1951.

TABLE 1

Ranking of Public Junior Colleges in Missouri Offering Various Student Personnel Services (Based on Negative Responses)

Instrument Scales	Negative Responses of Missouri Public Junior Colleges											Scale Rank
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	
Scale Number One												
Precollege Information	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.5
Scale Number Two												
Applicant Appraisal	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4.0
Scale Number Three												
Educational Testing	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	10.0
Scale Number Four												
Personnel Records	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	10.0
Scale Number Five												
Student Registration	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4.0
Scale Number Six												
Academic Regulation	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	12.5
Scale Number Seven												
Orientation	3	2	3	1	3	3	2	2	2	2	1	19.0
Scale Number Eight												
Financial Aids	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	6.0
Scale Number Nine												
Graduate Placement	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	2	1	0	0	14.0
Scale Number Ten												
Student Self-Government	1	0	3	0	1	0	0	2	1	0	0	15.5

TABLE 1

Ranking of Public Junior Colleges in Missouri Offering Various Student Personnel Services (Based on Negative Responses)

Instrument Scales	Negative Responses of Missouri Public Junior Colleges											Scale Rank
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	
Scale Number Eleven Cocurricular Activity	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7.5
Scale Number Twelve Social Regulator	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10.0
Scale Number Thirteen Student Supervision	2	1	2	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	15.5
Scale Number Fourteen Applicant Consulting	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.5
Scale Number Fifteen Student Advisement	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	7.5
Scale Number Sixteen Group Orienting	3	2	3	1	2	2	1	3	3	1	2	18.0
Scale Number Seventeen Student Counseling	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4.0
Scale Number Eighteen Career Information	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	12.5
Scale Number Nineteen Health Services	3	0	2	0	2	2	1	2	1	0	2	17.0
Negative Response Total	21	7	24	2	16	7	7	15	10	3	5	
Institute Program Rank	10	5	11	1	9	5	5	8	7	2	3	

TABLE 2

Student and Budget Figures for the Missouri Public Junior College Student Personnel Programs

Missouri Public Junior Colleges	Full Time Equivalent Students	Operating Budgets	Budget per FTE Student
A	365	$127,000.00	$347.95
B	3,352	341,654.00	101.93
C	235	26,675.00	113.51
D	3,000	370,000.00	123.33
E	461	40,000.00	86.76
F	460	67,000.00	145.65
G	3,725	255,909.00	68.70
H	368	8,200.00	22.28
I	819	59,320.00	72.43
J	4,090	460,000.00	112.47
K	850	91,000.00	107.06

TABLE 3

Ranking of Student Personnel Programs, Budgets, and Full Time Equivalent Student Population of the Missouri Public Junior Colleges

Missouri Public Junior Colleges	Program Rank	Budget Rank	FTE Student Rank
A	10	5	10
B	5	3	3
C	11	10	11
D	1	2	4
E	9	9	7
F	5	7	8
G	5	4	2
H	8	11	9
I	7	8	6
J	2	1	1
K	3	6	5

Note. - Rank correlation between program rank and budget rank, 0.7455 and program rank with FTE student rank, 0.7864 at .01 level of significance.